

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 25 2005

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application Serial No.09/875,245
Filing Date June 5, 2001
Inventor..... Sanghvi et al.
Group Art Unit2154
Examiner Patel, Haresh N.
Attorney's Docket No. MS1-700US
Confirmation No..... 7289
Title: Method and Apparatus for Event Distribution and Event Handling in an
Enterprise

APPEAL BRIEF

To: Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

From: Steven R. Sponseller (Tel. 509-324-9256 x250; Fax 509-323-8979)
Customer No. 22801

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §41.37, Appellant hereby submits an appeal brief for application 09/875,245, filed June 5, 2001, within the requisite time from the date of filing the Notice of Appeal. Accordingly, Appellant appeals to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences seeking review of the Examiner's rejections.

10/26/2005 CNGUYEN 00000081 120769 09875245

02 FC:1402 500.00 DA

<u>Appeal Brief Items</u>	<u>Page</u>
(1) Real Party in Interest	3
(2) Related Appeals and Interferences	3
(3) Status of Claims	3
(4) Status of Amendments	3
(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter	3
(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal	6
(7) Argument	6
(8) Appendix of Appealed Claims	23

(1) Real Party in Interest

The real party in interest is Microsoft Corporation, the assignee of all right, title and interest in and to the subject invention.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

Appellant is not aware of any other appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect, be directly affected by, or otherwise have a bearing on the Board's decision to this pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

Claims 1-29 stand rejected and are pending in this Application. Claims 1-29 are appealed. Claims 1-29 are set forth in the Appendix of Appealed Claims on page 23.

(4) Status of Amendments

A Final Office Action was issued on January 25, 2005.

Appellant filed a Notice of Appeal on July 25, 2005 in response to the Final Office Action.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

A concise explanation of each of the independent claims is included in this Summary section, including specific reference characters. These specific reference characters are examples of particular elements of the drawings for

certain embodiments of the claimed invention, and the claims are not limited to solely the elements corresponding to these reference characters.

With respect to independent claim 1, as discussed for example at page 14, line 10 through page 15, line 9, a method includes receiving a first event at a first event filter (Fig. 5, reference numeral 402), such that the first event filter has an associated filter criteria. The method further applies the filter criteria associated with the first event filter to the first event (404). Additionally, if the first event satisfies the filter criteria associated with the first event filter, the method transforms the first event into a second event (408) and communicates the second event to a second event filter having an associated filter criteria (410). The second event filter is associated with an event consumer that performs an action if the second event satisfies the filter criteria associated with the second event filter (420).

With respect to independent claim 11, as discussed for example at page 12, line 5 through page 18, line 18, a method includes receiving a first event having a first format (Fig. 5, reference numeral 402). The method further transforms the first event into a second event having a second format (408). Transforming the first event into the second event includes generating an event header (Fig. 6, reference numeral 502) having multiple parameters, such that the multiple parameters are arranged in a standard data format. Transforming the first event into the second event further includes generating an event payload (504) having multiple payload objects, such that the multiple payload objects identify at least one action to perform in response to the event.

With respect to independent claim 16, as discussed for example at page 11, line 14 through page 15, line 9, an apparatus includes an event transformer (Fig. 4, reference numeral 308) to receive a first event (304) and transform the first event into a second event (312), where the second event has a standard data format regardless of the first event data format. Multiple event filters (314, 320, 326, 332) are coupled to the event transformer (308), such that the event filters apply filter criteria to the second event (312). The apparatus further includes multiple event consumers (316, 322, 328, 334) that are coupled to the multiple event filters (314, 320, 326, 332), such that the event consumers perform an action if the second event satisfies the filter criteria applied by the event filters.

With respect to independent Claim 22, as discussed for example at page 14, line 10 through page 18, line 18, a computer-readable media has stored thereon a computer program that, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to receive a first event having a first data format (Fig. 5, reference numeral 402) and filter the first event using a first filter criteria (404). The first event is transformed into a second event having a second data format (408) if the first event satisfies the first filter criteria. The second data format includes an event header (502) having multiple parameters and an event payload (504) having multiple payload objects. The second event is communicated to an event action handler (410) if the first event satisfies the first filter criteria.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The Office alleges that claims 1-29 do not benefit from the provisional priority date as the effective filing date because the provisional application does not contain all the limitations of the claimed invention.

Claims 1-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,470,384 to O'Brien et al.

Claims 1, 10, 11, 15, 16 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,724,589 to Wold et al.

Claims 28 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,748,455 to Hinson et al.

Claims 28 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,829,770 to Hinson et al.

Claims 28 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,766,368 to Jakobson et al.

(7) Argument

A. Allegation that claims 1-29 do not benefit from the provisional priority date as the effective filing date.

Claims 1-29 are entitled to the provisional priority date as the effective filing date.

The Office states that claims 1-29 do not benefit from the provisional priority date and alleges that the description of payload objects and event filters is not contained in the provisional application. Regarding the description of payload

objects, Appellant notes that on page 15 of the present application, the specification states "An example of the header information and the payload information contained in an example distributed event is provided below." That example refers to the "Microsoft_EELEvent" distributed event – the header information and payload information for that event is presented on pages 16-18 of the present application. That same information regarding the Microsoft_EELEvent is also provided on pages 126-128 of the provisional application. Therefore, the provisional application does provide a description of payload and header information.

Regarding the description of event filters, Appellant notes that the first sentence of the provisional application states "Enterprise Event log is a unique way of using a set of WMI features to provide a distributed architecture to select, filter, correlate, forward, store and deliver events in an enterprise" (emphasis added). Further, pages 15-17 of the provisional application make various references to "event filters". For example, on page 15, the first sentence under the heading "Transformation Policy:" states "A transformation policy will install an event filter and an updating consumer that can generate a standard DEL event." Additionally, the figure on page 64 of the provisional application contains "Event Filters". These are just a few specific examples of the description of event filters in the provisional application. Event filters are also discussed in other parts of the provisional application. Thus, the provisional application does provide a description of event filters.

Accordingly, Appellant submits that claims 1-29 are entitled to the provisional priority date as the effective filing date.

B. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,470,384 to O'Brien et al.

Claims 1-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,470,384 to O'Brien et al. (hereinafter "O'Brien").

1. Claims 1-10

Claims 1-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,470,384 to O'Brien et al. (hereinafter "O'Brien"). Appellant respectfully submits that claims 1-27 are not anticipated by O'Brien.

O'Brien discloses:

A system and a method for configuring an action set for use in dynamically processing network events in a distributed computing environment are described. A graphical user interface associated with an action set is presented. An action set is stored into a database. At least one network event and at least one sensor are associated responsive to a user selection indicated on the graphical user interface. At least one action is embedded into the action set responsive to a user selection indicated on the graphical user interface. The association for the at least one network event and the embedding of the at least one action are stored into a mapping table. (O'Brien Abstract).

The modular framework for configuring action sets described in O'Brien is different from the claims of the present application.

Claim 1 of the present application recites:

1. A method comprising:
receiving a first event at a first event filter, the first event filter having an associated filter criteria;
applying the filter criteria associated with the first event filter to the first event;
if the first event satisfies the filter criteria associated with the first event filter, then:
transforming the first event into a second event; and
communicating the second event to a second event filter having an associated filter criteria, the second event filter being associated with an event consumer, wherein the event consumer performs an action if the second event satisfies the filter criteria associated with the second event filter.

Although O'Brien discloses a network manager 25 that receives network events 7 (see Fig. 2 of O'Brien), O'Brien fails to disclose or suggest "... transforming the first event into a second event; and communicating the second event to a second event filter having an associated filter criteria, the second event filter being associated with an event consumer" as recited in claim 1. O'Brien discloses event filters 40, but fails to mention transforming a first event into a second event, which is communicated to a second event filter.

The Office alleges support for transforming the first event into a second event by citing "mapping of network events 7 to actions 32". The mapping of network events 7 to actions 32 discussed in O'Brien is not the same as transforming the first event into a second event. Claim 1 further states, "the second event filter being associated with an event consumer, wherein the event consumer performs an action if the second event satisfies the filter criteria associated with the second event filter." Thus, as recited in claim 1, the first event

is transformed into the second event, which may cause an event consumer to perform an action if the second event satisfies the filter criteria associated with the second event filter. Thus, the language in claim 1 is not a mere mapping of network events to actions. Instead, the elements of claim 1 are different from the disclosure in O'Brien.

Accordingly, O'Brien fails to disclose the elements of claim 1. Thus, for at least these reasons, Appellant respectfully submits that claim 1 is allowable over O'Brien. Given that claims 2-10 depend from claim 1, Appellant respectfully submits that those claims are likewise allowable over O'Brien for at least the reasons discussed above.

2. Claims 11-15

Claim 11 of the present application recites:

11. A method comprising:
receiving a first event having a first format;
transforming the first event into a second event having a second
format, wherein transforming the first event into a second event comprises:
generating an event header having a plurality of parameters,
wherein the plurality of parameters are arranged in a standard data
format; and
generating an event payload having a plurality of payload
objects, wherein the plurality of payload objects identify at least one
action to perform in response to the event.

As discussed above with respect to claim 1, O'Brien fails to disclose transforming the first event into a second event. Further, O'Brien fails to disclose "... wherein transforming the first event into a second event comprises: generating

an event header ... and generating an event payload having a plurality of payload objects” as recited in claim 11. Since O’Brien fails to disclose transforming a first event into a second event, O’Brien makes no mention of how the first event is transformed into a second event by generating an event header and an event payload.

Accordingly, O’Brien fails to disclose the elements of claim 11. Thus, for at least these reasons, Appellant respectfully submits that claim 11 is allowable over O’Brien. Given that claims 12-15 depend from claim 11, Appellant respectfully submits that those claims are likewise allowable over O’Brien for at least the reasons discussed above.

3. Claims 16-21

Claim 16 of the present application recites:

16. An apparatus comprising:
an event transformer to receive a first event and transform the first event into a second event, the second event having a standard data format regardless of the first event data format;
a plurality of event filters coupled to the event transformer, the event filters to apply filter criteria to the second event; and
a plurality of event consumers coupled to the plurality of event filters, the event consumers to perform an action if the second event satisfies the filter criteria applied by the event filters.

The O’Brien reference fails to disclose “an event transformer to receive a first event and transform the first event into a second event....” as recited in claim 16. As discussed above with respect to claim 1, O’Brien fails to disclose

transforming a first event into a second event. Accordingly, Appellant submits that O'Brien is silent as to an event transformer. Although O'Brien discloses a manager 25, the manager 25 does not transform a first event into a second event.

Accordingly, O'Brien fails to disclose the elements of claim 16. Thus, for at least these reasons, Appellant respectfully submits that claim 16 is allowable over O'Brien. Given that claims 17-21 depend from claim 16, Appellant respectfully submits that those claims are likewise allowable over O'Brien for at least the reasons discussed above.

4. Claims 22-27

Claim 22 of the present application recites:

22. One or more computer-readable media having stored thereon a computer program that, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to:

receive a first event having a first data format;

filter the first event using a first filter criteria;

transform the first event into a second event having a second data format if the first event satisfies the first filter criteria, wherein the second data format includes an event header having a plurality of parameters and an event payload having a plurality of payload objects; and

communicate the second event to an event action handler if the first event satisfies the first filter criteria.

The O'Brien reference fails to disclose a processor that transforms "the first event into a second event having a second data format ... wherein the second data format includes an event header ... and an event payload...." as recited in claim

22. As discussed above with respect to claim 1, O'Brien fails to disclose

transforming a first event into a second event. Further, as discussed above with respect to claim 11, O'Brien does not disclose how the first event is transformed into a second event having an event header and an event payload.

Accordingly, O'Brien fails to disclose the elements of claim 22. Thus, for at least these reasons, Appellant respectfully submits that claim 22 is allowable over O'Brien. Given that claims 23-27 depend from claim 22, Appellant respectfully submits that those claims are likewise allowable over O'Brien for at least the reasons discussed above.

C. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,724,589 to Wold et al.

Claims 1, 10, 11, 15, 16 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,724,589 to Wold et al. (hereinafter "Wold").

1. Claims 1 and 10

Wold discloses:

A development system providing a property-method-event programming (PME) model for developing context-free reusable software components is described. Despite the absence of any C++ language support for events, the present invention provides a type-safe "wiring" mechanism--one using standard C++ to dispatch an event, raised by one object (the "event source"), to a method of another object (the "event sink"), with the

requirement that the event source does not need to know the class of the event sink. As a result, the system allows developers to create C++ software components which can be connected together without the components having to know anything about the makeup of the component to which it is connected. Thus, developers can create pre-packaged, reusable software components which can simply be "plugged into" a design--all accomplished within the confines of the standard C++ programming language (i.e., without having to employ proprietary extensions). (Wold Abstract).

The development system described in the Wold reference is different from the claims of the present application.

Claim 1 of the present application recites:

1. A method comprising:
 - receiving a first event at a first event filter, the first event filter having an associated filter criteria;
 - applying the filter criteria associated with the first event filter to the first event;
 - if the first event satisfies the filter criteria associated with the first event filter, then:
 - transforming the first event into a second event; and
 - communicating the second event to a second event filter having an associated filter criteria, the second event filter being associated with an event consumer, wherein the event consumer performs an action if the second event satisfies the filter criteria associated with the second event filter.

Wold fails to disclose or suggest "... transforming the first event into a second event" as recited in claim 1. Wold discloses that a single event may be "passed along an event chain 710 to successive objects, some of which may elect to act upon the event." Col. 9, lines 61-63. However, Wold fails to mention transforming a first event into a second event, as recited in claim 1. Merely

communicating a single event between successive objects (as disclosed in Wold) is very different from transforming a first event into a second event.

Accordingly, Wold fails to disclose the elements of claim 1. Thus, for at least these reasons, Appellant respectfully submits that claim 1 is allowable over Wold. Given that claim 10 depends from claim 1, Appellant respectfully submits that claim 10 is likewise allowable over Wold for at least the reasons discussed above.

2. Claims 11 and 15

Claim 11 of the present application recites:

11. A method comprising:
receiving a first event having a first format;
transforming the first event into a second event having a second format, wherein transforming the first event into a second event comprises:
generating an event header having a plurality of parameters, wherein the plurality of parameters are arranged in a standard data format; and
generating an event payload having a plurality of payload objects, wherein the plurality of payload objects identify at least one action to perform in response to the event.

Appellant submits that Wold fails to disclose transforming a first event into a second event having a second format, as recited in claim 11. As discussed above with reference to claim 1, Wold fails to mention any type of event transformation. Further, Wold fails to disclose "... wherein transforming the first event into a second event comprises: generating an event header ... and generating an event payload having a plurality of payload objects" as recited in claim 11. Since

Wold fails to disclose transforming a first event into a second event, Wold makes no mention of how the first event is transformed into a second event by generating an event header and an event payload.

Accordingly, Wold fails to disclose the elements of claim 11. Thus, for at least these reasons, Appellant respectfully submits that claim 11 is allowable over Wold. Given that claim 15 depends from claim 11, Appellant respectfully submits that claim 15 is likewise allowable over Wold for at least the reasons discussed above.

3. Claim 16

Claim 16 of the present application recites:

16. An apparatus comprising:
an event transformer to receive a first event and transform the first event into a second event, the second event having a standard data format regardless of the first event data format;
a plurality of event filters coupled to the event transformer, the event filters to apply filter criteria to the second event; and
a plurality of event consumers coupled to the plurality of event filters, the event consumers to perform an action if the second event satisfies the filter criteria applied by the event filters.

The Wold reference fails to disclose “an event transformer to receive a first event and transform the first event into a second event...” as recited in claim 16. As discussed above with respect to claim 1, Wold fails to disclose transforming a first event into a second event. Accordingly, Appellant submits that Wold is silent as to an event transformer.

Accordingly, Wold fails to disclose the elements of claim 16. Thus, for at least these reasons, Appellant respectfully submits that claim 16 is allowable over Wold.

4. Claim 22

Claim 22 of the present application recites:

22. One or more computer-readable media having stored thereon a computer program that, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to:

receive a first event having a first data format;

filter the first event using a first filter criteria;

transform the first event into a second event having a second data format if the first event satisfies the first filter criteria, wherein the second data format includes an event header having a plurality of parameters and an event payload having a plurality of payload objects; and

communicate the second event to an event action handler if the first event satisfies the first filter criteria.

The Wold reference fails to disclose a processor that transforms “the first event into a second event having a second data format ... wherein the second data format includes an event header ... and an event payload....” as recited in claim 22. As discussed above with respect to claim 1, Wold fails to disclose transforming a first event into a second event. Further, as discussed above with respect to claim 11, Wold does not disclose how the first event is transformed into a second event having an event header and an event payload.

Accordingly, Wold fails to disclose the elements of claim 22. Thus, for at least these reasons, Appellant respectfully submits that claim 22 is allowable over Wold.

D. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,748,455 to Hinson et al.

Claims 28 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,748,455 to Hinson et al. (hereinafter "Hinson1").

Claims 28 and 29 depend from claim 1 and, therefore, include all of the limitations of claim 1.

Claim 1 of the present application recites:

1. A method comprising:
 - receiving a first event at a first event filter, the first event filter having an associated filter criteria;
 - applying the filter criteria associated with the first event filter to the first event;
 - if the first event satisfies the filter criteria associated with the first event filter, then:
 - transforming the first event into a second event; and
 - communicating the second event to a second event filter having an associated filter criteria, the second event filter being associated with an event consumer, wherein the event consumer performs an action if the second event satisfies the filter criteria associated with the second event filter.

Hinson1 fails to disclose or suggest "transforming the first event into a second event", as recited in claim 1. The Office alleges that Hinson1 discloses this element of claim 1 in figure 36, col. 16, lines 36-54. The cited portion of

Hinson1 discloses search criteria and fails to make any mention of transforming a first event into a second event. Further, Fig. 36 is "a program listing of code in the publisher to install the publisher filter object of Fig. 34." (Hinson1, col. 7, lines 15-16). Fig. 36 of Hinson1 fails to make any reference to transforming a first event into a second event.

Accordingly, Hinson1 fails to disclose the elements of claim 1. Thus, for at least these reasons, Appellant respectfully submits that claim 1 is allowable over Hinson1. Given that claims 28 and 29 depend from claim 1, Appellant respectfully submits that those claims are likewise allowable over Hinson1 for at least the reasons discussed above.

E. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,829,770 to Hinson et al.

Claims 28 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,829,770 to Hinson et al. (hereinafter "Hinson2").

As mentioned above, claims 28 and 29 depend from claim 1 and, therefore, include all of the limitations of claim 1.

Claim 1 of the present application recites:

1. A method comprising:
receiving a first event at a first event filter, the first event filter
having an associated filter criteria;
applying the filter criteria associated with the first event filter to the
first event;

if the first event satisfies the filter criteria associated with the first event filter, then:

transforming the first event into a second event; and
communicating the second event to a second event filter having an associated filter criteria, the second event filter being associated with an event consumer, wherein the event consumer performs an action if the second event satisfies the filter criteria associated with the second event filter.

Hinson2 fails to disclose or suggest "transforming the first event into a second event", as recited in claim 1. The Office alleges that Hinson2 discloses this element of claim 1 in figure 36, col. 16, lines 36-54. The cited portion of Hinson2 discloses various interfaces and the installation of objects in the system. However, the cited portion of Hinson2 fails to make any mention of transforming a first event into a second event. Further, Fig. 36 of Hinson2 is "a program listing of code in the publisher to install the publisher filter object of Fig. 34." (Hinson2, col. 7, lines 15-16). Fig. 36 of Hinson2 fails to make any reference to transforming a first event into a second event.

Accordingly, Hinson2 fails to disclose the elements of claim 1. Thus, for at least these reasons, Appellant respectfully submits that claim 1 is allowable over Hinson2. Given that claims 28 and 29 depend from claim 1, Appellant respectfully submits that those claims are likewise allowable over Hinson2 for at least the reasons discussed above.

F. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,766,368 to Jakobson et al.

Claims 28 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,766,368 to Jakobson et al. (hereinafter "Jakobson").

As mentioned above, claims 28 and 29 depend from claim 1 and, therefore, include all of the limitations of claim 1.

Claim 1 of the present application recites:

1. A method comprising:
receiving a first event at a first event filter, the first event filter having an associated filter criteria;
applying the filter criteria associated with the first event filter to the first event;
if the first event satisfies the filter criteria associated with the first event filter, then:
transforming the first event into a second event; and
communicating the second event to a second event filter having an associated filter criteria, the second event filter being associated with an event consumer, wherein the event consumer performs an action if the second event satisfies the filter criteria associated with the second event filter.

Jakobson fails to disclose or suggest "transforming the first event into a second event", as recited in claim 1. The Office alleges that Jakobson discloses this element of claim 1 in figures 5 and 8, and at col. 9, lines 36-61. The cited portion of Jakobson discloses various services including services that originate an event and services that receive an event. This discussion of services fails to make any reference to transforming a first event into a second event. Further, figure 5

illustrates an event notification service, and figure 8 illustrates an event correlation component and related services and components. Neither figure 5 nor figure 8 of Jakobson disclose the transformation of a first event into a second event as recited in claim 1.


Accordingly, Jakobson fails to disclose the elements of claim 1. Thus, for at least these reasons, Appellant respectfully submits that claim 1 is allowable over Jakobson. Given that claims 28 and 29 depend from claim 1, Appellant respectfully submits that those claims are likewise allowable over Jakobson for at least the reasons discussed above.

Conclusion

The Office's basis and supporting rationale for rejecting claims 1-29 is not supported by the cited references. Appellant respectfully requests that the rejections be overturned and that pending claims 1-29 be allowed to issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 10-13-05

By: 
Steven R. Sponseller
Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Reg. No. 39,384
(509) 324-9256 ext. 250

(8) Appendix of Appealed Claims**1. A method comprising:**

receiving a first event at a first event filter, the first event filter having an associated filter criteria;

applying the filter criteria associated with the first event filter to the first event;

if the first event satisfies the filter criteria associated with the first event filter, then:

transforming the first event into a second event; and

communicating the second event to a second event filter having an associated filter criteria, the second event filter being associated with an event consumer, wherein the event consumer performs an action if the second event satisfies the filter criteria associated with the second event filter.

2. A method as recited in claim 1 wherein the second event includes a header having a plurality of parameters, wherein the event header has a standard data format regardless of event source.

3. A method as recited in claim 1 wherein the second event includes a payload including a plurality of payload objects.

4. A method as recited in claim 1 wherein the second event filter has no knowledge of the first event.

5. A method as recited in claim 1 wherein communicating the second event to a second event filter further comprises communicating the second event to a plurality of event filters, each of the plurality of event filters having an associated filter criteria.

6. A method as recited in claim 1 wherein communicating the second event to a second event filter further comprises communicating the second event to a plurality of event filters, each of the plurality of event filters having an associated filter criteria and each of the plurality of event filters being associated with one of a plurality of event consumers, wherein each of the plurality of event consumers performs an action if the second event satisfies the filter criteria associated with the corresponding event filter.

7. A method as recited in claim 1 wherein the action performed by the event consumer if the second event satisfies the filter criteria associated with the second event filter is logging the second event to a storage device.

8. A method as recited in claim 1 wherein the action performed by the event consumer if the second event satisfies the filter criteria associated with the second event filter is forwarding the second event to a destination.

9. A method as recited in claim 1 wherein the action performed by the event consumer if the second event satisfies the filter criteria associated with the second event filter is generating an email message.

10. One or more computer-readable memories containing a computer program that is executable by a processor to perform the method recited in claim 1.

11. A method comprising:
receiving a first event having a first format;
transforming the first event into a second event having a second format,
wherein transforming the first event into a second event comprises:
generating an event header having a plurality of parameters, wherein
the plurality of parameters are arranged in a standard data format; and
generating an event payload having a plurality of payload objects,
wherein the plurality of payload objects identify at least one action to
perform in response to the event.

12. A method as recited in claim 11 further comprising applying the plurality of parameters in the event header to a filter to determine whether the associated event meets criteria associated with the filter.

13. A method as recited in claim 11 wherein the plurality of parameters are arranged in a standard data format regardless of the first event source.

14. A method as recited in claim 11 further comprising:
applying the second event to an event filter having an associated filter criteria; and
communicating the second event to an event consumer if the second event satisfies the filter criteria associated with the event filter.

15. One or more computer-readable memories containing a computer program that is executable by a processor to perform the method recited in claim 11.

16. An apparatus comprising:
an event transformer to receive a first event and transform the first event into a second event, the second event having a standard data format regardless of the first event data format;
a plurality of event filters coupled to the event transformer, the event filters to apply filter criteria to the second event; and
a plurality of event consumers coupled to the plurality of event filters, the event consumers to perform an action if the second event satisfies the filter criteria applied by the event filters.

17. An apparatus as recited in claim 16 wherein the event transformer operates independently of the event filters and independently of the event consumers.

18. An apparatus as recited in claim 16 wherein the second event includes an event header having a plurality of parameters arranged in a standard data format.

19. An apparatus as recited in claim 16 wherein the second event includes an event header having a plurality of parameters arranged in a standard data format, and wherein the plurality of parameters in the event header are applied to the event filters to determine whether the associated event satisfies the filter criteria.

20. An apparatus as recited in claim 16 wherein the second event includes an event payload having a plurality of payload objects.

21. An apparatus as recited in claim 16 wherein the second event includes an event payload having a plurality of payload objects, and wherein the plurality of payload objects identify at least one action to perform in response to the event.

22. One or more computer-readable media having stored thereon a computer program that, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to:

receive a first event having a first data format;

filter the first event using a first filter criteria;

transform the first event into a second event having a second data format if the first event satisfies the first filter criteria, wherein the second data format includes an event header having a plurality of parameters and an event payload having a plurality of payload objects; and

communicate the second event to an event action handler if the first event satisfies the first filter criteria.

23. One or more computer-readable media as recited in claim 22 wherein the plurality of parameters in the event header are arranged in a standard format.

24. One or more computer-readable media as recited in claim 22 wherein the plurality of parameters in the event header are used to filter the second event.

25. One or more computer-readable media as recited in claim 22 wherein the plurality of payload objects in the event payload are used to identify at least one action to perform in response to the second event.

26. One or more computer-readable media as recited in claim 22 wherein the plurality of payload objects in the event payload are used by an event consumer that receives the second event to identify an action to perform in response to the second event.

27. One or more computer-readable media as recited in claim 22 wherein the event action handler performs at least one action in response to the second event.

28. A method as recited in claim 1 wherein the filter criteria associated with the first event filter includes an event type.

29. A method as recited in claim 1 wherein the filter criteria associated with the second event filter includes an event type.